UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

Center for Advanced Judaic Studies, University of Pennsylvania

Werner's "The Sacred Bridge," Volume 2: A Review Essay
Author(s): Peter Jeffery
Source: *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, Vol. 77, No. 4 (Apr., 1987), pp. 283-298
Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1454368
Accessed: 22/01/2011 16:51

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=upenn.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

University of Pennsylvania Press and *Center for Advanced Judaic Studies, University of Pennsylvania* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Jewish Quarterly Review.*

http://www.jstor.org

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, LXXVII, No. 4 (April, 1987) 283–298

WERNER'S *THE SACRED BRIDGE*, VOLUME 2: A REVIEW ESSAY

By PETER JEFFERY, University of Delaware

ERIC WERNER'S *The Sacred Bridge* (hereafter *TSB*) was completed in 1950 and first published in 1959.[1] The present book, described as a second volume (hereafter *TSB2*),[2] "stands in place of a second, greatly enlarged, and revised edition of the first volume" (p. ix). Werner is one of the generation of scholars that founded the discipline of musicology in the United States. His many publications were among the first to deal seriously with the possible historical interrelationships between Jewish and Christian liturgical chant, at a time when many aspects of this music were less fully understood than they are today. Thus the original *TSB* was greeted with much interest by reviewers, and it has remained for almost three decades the classic in its subject, the only book-length study of "the interdependence of liturgy and music in Synagogue and Church during the first millennium," as the subtitle states. But the reason it has maintained this preeminent status has less to do with the inherent quality of the book than with the enormous fascination that the subject-matter holds for so many scholars working in a wide range of fields. As scholars have used *TSB* over the years, its many weaknesses have become increasingly evident. Yet no one has attempted to write a better book, both because of the extraordinary difficulty of the subject and because of the welter of entrenched preconceptions and prejudices that threaten to engulf anyone working in it. To mold into a single historical synthesis the thousand-year history of early Jewish and Christian liturgy and music requires a singular vision and a devoted commitment, as well as a vast array of abilities,

---

[1] Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959; partial reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1970; full reprint, New York: Da Capo Press, 1979).

[2] Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge: The Interdependence of Liturgy and Music in Synagogue and Church during the First Millennium*, Volume 2 (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1984), pp. xviii + 271.

more than any one individual could reasonably be expected to command. These abilities would have to include an up-to-date grounding in biblical scholarship, a broad familiarity with both the rabbinic and the patristic (i.e., early Christian) literatures, a thorough training in the dozen or more ancient languages in which these literatures were composed, an expert knowledge of the historical development of Jewish and Christian liturgies in all their regional variety and structural intricacy, a firm grasp of musical paleography and the history of music theory, and of course a profound understanding of all the ancient cultures and thought patterns in which these things found concrete expression. Besides, the histories of Judaism and Christianity (including their worship and music) are still matters of vital importance today, to many people of all and even of no religious persuasions. Even the most informed and objective scholar must work extremely carefully to extricate himself from the morass of inherited myths, attitudes, and misunderstandings that are still treasured by so many people—not only by religious Jews and Christians but also by almost everyone who is heir to Western Judeo-Christian culture. In a subject so complex and so deeply cared about, which requires prodigious erudition combined with truly heroic sensitivity and humility, it is scarcely surprising that no one has ever tried to supersede *TSB*, that those who criticized it often focused on specific points rather than on the book as a whole, or that many scholars simply refrained altogether from even mentioning the book in print. This is why in *TSB2* Werner more than once expresses the feeling that his work has been unfairly slighted or ignored (pp. x, 219, 245)—but no one is fully qualified to give it a completely even-handed evaluation. It was in recognition of this fact that one journal has published three separate reviews of *TSB2*, by specialists in different areas.[3] I am sure that my own attempt to be fair will also fall short of the ideal. But it is only by extended constructive dialogue among large numbers of specialists in many disciplines that progress in this highly ramified subject can possibly be made.

---

[3] *Musica Judaica: Journal of the American Society for Jewish Music* 8 (1985–86): 87–94. The three reviewers were Theodore Karp, a specialist in medieval Western music; Miloš Velimirović, a specialist in Byzantine Christian chant; and Richard S. Sarason, a specialist in rabbinic literature.

The aim of *TSB2* is to improve upon *TSB* by generally bringing the discussion up to date, by filling "certain lacunae," by correcting "some, but by no means all, errors," and by "re-examining certain sources and questions *de novo*" (p. ix). But none of these purposes was fully achieved. First, only with great reservations can one describe the book as up-to-date. According to the preface, it "was originally destined to appear in 1974," but this was prevented by "technical and personal difficulties." Nonetheless, the book in its present form still appears to be a work of the early 1970s. The footnotes cite very little bibliography dated after that time,[4] and several publications from the 1960s and even earlier are described as "recently published."[5] But much of the book was not even new in 1974, for it has to a great degree been constructed out of articles published over the two preceding decades, sometimes (particularly chapters 2, 5, 6, and much of 8) with minimal revision. Admittedly, *TSB* also incorporated a significant number of earlier writings, but *TSB2* seems to be less successful at pulling all these disparate items together into a consistent picture; the new passages that were inserted to accomplish this end often attempt to force insufficiently revised material to support positions different from the ones that the author had in mind when he wrote the original articles.

As for filling the lacunae and correcting the errors of *TSB*, on this count *TSB2* does not go nearly far enough, partly because so much of the material has not been thoroughly revised. The great number of errors in *TSB* was one of its chief weaknesses, par-

---

[4] The only works later than 1974 are Werner's own publications and Karl Erich Grözinger's *Musik und Gesang in der Theologie der frühen jüdischen Literatur: Talmud, Midrasch, Mystik* (Tübingen, 1982), which appeared just as *TSB2* was finally going to press, too late to be of much use.

[5] On p. 68 a publication of 1922 (J. M. Harden's edition of Jerome's *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos*) is described as "recent." This occurs in a section that was taken over verbatim from the 1954 article from which this chapter is derived: "The Origin of Psalmody," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 25 (1954): 327–45, cf. p. 342. The unsuspecting reader is given no hint that there are more recent editions of Jerome's text, or (more importantly) that his translation was based less on "hebraica veritas" and more on Greek models than Jerome was willing to admit. See Colette Estin, *Les psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures* (Collectanea Biblica Latina, 15) (Rome, 1984). The *juxta Hebraeos* has no place in Werner's discussion of "punctuating melismata" anyway, for it is not known ever to have seen liturgical use.

ticularly the frequently inaccurate and incomplete quotation and citation of primary and secondary sources. Thus it was often difficult to check some of Werner's evidence unless one was already quite familiar with the material which he was discussing. *TSB2* corrects relatively few of these errors, but adds a great many new ones. Enough examples have been listed by other reviewers (and will be brought up later in the present review) to obviate listing any more of them here.[6] Besides the outright errors, *TSB* often made too much of Jewish-Christian parallels that were in fact merely superficial. This tendency is still evident in *TSB2*, for instance in the section on "Musical Elements of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (pp. 26–43).[7] There Werner points to allegedly striking visual similarities between certain marginal signs in the first Isaiah scroll from Qumran (1QIs^{a})[8] and some of the large signs of Byzantine-Slavonic kondakarian notation.[9] The meanings of both systems of markings remain obscure, but attempts to interpret them have continued since Werner first published this section in 1957; these attempts, unfortunately, lead in two different directions. Most of the marks in the Isaiah scroll occur in the margins and were evidently used for marking paragraphs, although a couple of them may have been intended to mark words with special significance in the exegesis of the Qumran community.[10] The Slavonic neumes, written above the text in the upper level of a two-layer musical notation, appear to stand for musical formulas or phrases, and are now known to be related to

---

[6] In addition to the three reviews cited above, see the remarks of J. A. Smith in *Music and Letters* 67 (1986): 316–20, especially 319. I do not agree with all of Smith's other criticisms however.

[7] Little changed since it was published as an article in *The Musical Quarterly* 43 (1957): 21–37. The chapter does not incorporate any of the changes made in a later form of the article: "Die Bedeutung der Totenmeerrollen für die Musikgeschichte," *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 4 (1963): 21–35.

[8] Werner cited incompletely the source of his information. It is John C. Trever, "The Isaiah Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. Vol. I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, ed. Millar Burrows et al. (New Haven, 1950), p. xvi.

[9] In citing his source of information on this Werner misspells the name of the author, R. Palikarova Verdeil.

[10] Malachi Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1 (Bibliothèque du *Muséon* 44 [1958]: 171–89).

comparable markings in the notation of the Byzantine Asmatikon repertoire.[11] The probability that the two sets of signs functioned in different ways does not encourage the view that they are historically related, particularly in the absence of a plausible channel by which they could have been transmitted from the Qumran community to medieval Byzantium or Russia. But in fact there is scarcely any justification for engaging in such speculations. Werner admits that "only five of the signs are found in both source groups" (p. 30), although there are twice as many in the Hebrew scroll and a far larger number in the Slavonic sources. But even among these five, Werner's drawings (p. 29) distort some of the Slavonic forms (the second one has even been reversed) in order to make the resemblance seem stronger than it is.

The section on the Dead Sea Scrolls is combined with another originally independent article on "St. Paul's Attitude to Music" (pp. 43–50),[12] to form chapter 2, which purports to compare "two sects and their music," according to the chapter's subtitle. There is little actual comparison, because the two articles are essentially reprinted one after the other. What new material there is (for instance, pp. 25–26, the second and third paragraphs on p. 43, the last paragraph on p. 48) seeks to establish as the main theme of the chapter a contrast between the Dead Sea sect's "withdrawal from the world" and St. Paul's "concern for the world." But this interpretation—whatever its merits—rests on a weak foundation, due to the author's limited familiarity with much important research on these subjects. For instance, he treats all the Pauline epistles as genuine works of the apostle,

[11] For some recent bibliography see Kenneth Levy, "Die slavische Kondakarien-Notation," *Anfänge der slavischen Musik* (Bratislava, 1966), pp. 77–92. Levy, "The Earliest Slavic Melismatic Chants," *Fundamental Problems of Early Slavic Music and Poetry*, ed. Christian Hannick (Studies on the Fragmenta Chiliandarica Palaeoslavica, 2; Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Subsidia, 6) (Copenhagen, 1978), pp. 197–210. Constantin Floros, "Die Entzifferung der Kondakarien-Notation," *Musik des Ostens* 3 (1965): 7–71; 4 (1967): 12–44. There is also the beginning of a critical edition of the kondakar, the type of book that contains this notation: Antonín Dostál, Hans Rothe, and Erich Trapp, *Der altrussische Kondakar': Auf der Grundlage des Blagovesčenskij Nižegorodskij Kondakar'.* Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slawen, Editionen 8 (Giessen, 1976–).

[12] Little has been changed from its appearance in article form in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13 (1960): 18–23.

despite wide agreement among New Testament scholars that some (notably Ephesians and Colossians with their provocative references to "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs") are more probably pseudonymous or "Deutero-Pauline."[13] The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the material still belongs essentially to the 1950s. Historians have by now moved beyond the simplistic dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism that Werner relies on (pp. 47–50).[14] And the hymnody of the Dead Sea sect has been the subject of considerable research.[15]

Another poor fit can be seen in chapter 4, where a previously published article on Jewish parallels to the Christian veneration of saints (pp. 80–95)[16] has been bracketed between apparently new discussions of "The Connection of Psalmody with the Lesson and with the Ecclesiastical Year." The juxtaposition ignores the fact that the temporal cycle (i.e., the movable feasts dependent mainly on the date of Easter) is more ancient, more important in the historical development of the liturgy, and more closely related to Jewish antecedents than the sanctoral cycle of saints' feasts.[17] Relying heavily on Jacob Mann's theories regarding the reading of the psalms in the ancient synagogue, Werner does not address the considerable criticism that has been leveled at Mann's work, or even acknowledge the awesome complexity of the material with which Mann contended.[18] Worse, Werner ignores the fact

---

[13] See the remarks in Norman Perrin, *The New Testament: An Introduction* (New York, 1974), pp. 119–41. Raymond E. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York, 1984), pp. 47–48.

[14] It is now recognized that both Judaism and early Christianity existed in a multiplicity of forms that were Semitic or Hellenistic to varying degrees. See Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Jonathan Z. Smith, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987). Raymond E. Brown, "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 74–79.

[15] See, among many other publications, Bonnie P. Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series) (Chico, California, 1981). Carol Newsom, *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 27) (Atlanta, 1985). Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 28) (Atlanta, 1986).

[16] "Traces of Jewish Hagiolatry," *HUCA* 51 (1980): 39–60.

[17] For a new study see Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (New York, 1986).

[18] See for instance Nahum M. Sarna's book review in *JBL* 87 (1968): 100–05; or more recently, James W. McKinnon, "On the Question of Psalmody in the

that a complete annual cycle of readings, responsorial psalms, and alleluias still survives from the early fifth-century Christian liturgy of Jerusalem, even though he is inclined to agree that "the Western Alleluia . . . was imported from the Jerusalem Church, as E. Wellesz has suggested" (p. 104).[19]

Chapter 6, "Two Hymns for Passover and Good Friday," can be regarded as a sort of microcosm of Werner's work as a whole, illustrating the many obstacles encountered by anyone who makes a sincere effort to study his writings and follow his reasoning carefully. It reprints with few changes an article Werner published in 1966, but without incorporating any of the additional material that appeared in a related article the following year.[20] The 1967 article attempts to answer some of the objections that could legitimately be raised against the earlier one; it is thus unfortunate that these rebuttals were not included in *TSB2*. In this chapter Werner takes up the unhappy subject of the *Improperia* (Reproaches) sung at the *Adoratio Crucis* service on Good Friday. He seeks to identify Melito of Sardis as the author, averring that he "certainly mastered Syriac" (p. 142) and knew Hebrew—not generally accepted facts, to say the least—and that he "was familiar with . . . the *Dayenu* litany." Werner's characterization of Melito as the "first poet of Deicide" is reasonable enough, but

---

Ancient Synagogue," *Early Music History* 6 (1986): 159–91. Mann's first volume has been reprinted with a new prolegomenon by Ben Zion Wacholder (New York, 1971). For a more recent and balanced view of the kinds of problems that Mann was grappling with, see Avigdor Shinan, "Sermons, Targums, and the Reading from Scriptures in the Ancient Synagogue," *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (Philadelphia, 1987), pp. 97–110.

[19] Ed. Athanase Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, 2 vols (Patrologia Orientalis, 35/1 & 36/2) (Turnhout, 1969, 1971). On p. 18 of the article cited by Werner, Wellesz incorrectly stated that "no documents have come down to us attesting that the Alleluia was sung in the early centuries in the Church of Jerusalem." The contents of the Jerusalem lectionary had been available since 1905, though its early date and historical significance were less widely appreciated than they should have been. See F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford, 1905), pp. 507–27.

[20] Chapter 6 is largely identical with "Melito of Sardes, the First Poet of Deicide," *HUCA* 37 (1966): 191–210. Some of the same material appeared also in the rather different article "Zur Textgeschichte der Improperia," *Festschrift Bruno Stäblein zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Martin Ruhnke (Kassel, 1967), pp. 274–86. Besides the edition of Melito that Werner used, we now have Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha and Fragments: Texts and Translations*, ed. Stuart G. Hall (Oxford, 1979).

he arguably overestimates the influence of a person whose writings were scarcely known during the Middle Ages (the poetic homily *On the Passion* that makes the Deicide charges seems to have circulated widely up to about the fourth century, but it disappeared until rediscovered in the twentieth). Even if we allow with Werner that the *Dayenu* already existed in Melito's time (second century C.E.), it is still impossible that Melito could have written the *Improperia*—the text is not a unity, and its several parts clearly date from centuries after Melito. The earliest part, the *Trisagion*, emerged in the fifth century, but only in the late ninth century does it appear as part of the Good Friday service in manuscripts of Gregorian chant. The next oldest part (verses 1–3 in Werner's numbering) occurs first in manuscripts of the late ninth and tenth centuries,[21] while the third part (verses 4–12 on p. 129) is attested only in the eleventh century.[22] There is no hint in *TSB2* that Werner responds to part of this objection in his 1967 article, where he asserts that the *Trisagion* "is already found in its normal form, with slight variations, in the pre-Christian Apocalypse of Abraham."[23] This quite startling statement is not supported by any bibliography or by citation of the relevant passage(s) in the Apocalypse. Therefore readers who are unable to locate the text, or are unwilling to read it from beginning to end, are prevented from confirming the veracity of Werner's assertion. Fortunately Werner did cite the relevant passage in another article published about the same time (conveniently reprinted in *TSB2*, p. 120 and n. 46, although not cross-referenced from chapter 6). Werner's remarks in this place and a direct check of the Apocalypse of Abraham[24] show that the text contains

[21] René-Jean Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* (Brussels, 1935; reprinted Rome, 1968), pp. 96–97. Werner says that "from the seventh century onwards, the Latin text is fully documented, even in the Mozarabic version" (p. 133). But the Mozarabic text cited by Werner contains only the incipit "Popule meus," and later Mozarabic sources include a variety of texts with this beginning.

[22] A good summary history of the *Improperia* is Herman A. P. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta* 2 (Rome, 1957): 793–95. Werner cited this book in another connection (p. 74), but seems not to have fully absorbed what it says about the *Improperia*.

[23] "Zur Textgeschichte der *Improperia*," p. 279, n. 13.

[24] A new translation and commentary by R. Rubinkiewicz appears in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 1 (Garden City, New York, 1983), pp. 681–705.

considerably less than the "normal form" of the *Trisagion*—in fact nothing more than the repeated use of the epithet "Eternal, Mighty One" (in one case followed by "Holy God") as a divine address. Nor can the Apocalypse be accepted without further ado as a "pre-Christian" source: according to the new commentary of Rubinkiewicz (pp. 683–84), it was written after the destruction of the Second Temple, and survives only in an Old Slavonic translation that has been tampered with by Christian and Bogomil editors.

In seeking to demonstrate a Hebrew or Syriac background to the *Improperia*, Werner failed to make use of quite different evidence that led Anton Baumstark to make a similar suggestion.[25] While acknowledging that parts of the *Improperia* closely paraphrase the Latin Bible,[26] Werner does not seem to recognize that this tilts the scale in favor of only indirect reliance on an Eastern model, whether by Melito or by anyone else. But the most likely Eastern liturgical antecedent of the *Improperia*, as of the *Adoratio Crucis* service to which it belongs, is the early liturgy of Jerusalem, specifically a series of twelve troparia that are preserved in Georgian, Greek, and Syriac sources,[27] and in such Latin examples as the famous Beneventan antiphon *O quando in cruce*. In *TSB2* Werner simply dismisses these troparia as "more primitive" (p. 128), but his reasons are spelled out in the article of 1967 (pp. 274–75). There he compares, in parallel columns, the list of God's blessings upon Israel according to each of the three sources, concluding that the Latin *Improperia* resemble the *Dayenu* more than they do the Jerusalem troparia.

---

[25] "Der Orient und die Gesänge der *Adoratio crucis*," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 2 (1922): 1–17, especially 14–16. Werner cites these very pages on p. 246, n. 7, but in a different connection; cf. p. 132.

[26] On pp. 145–46 Werner erroneously cites a passage as "IV Esdras 15:7–24 (=V Esdras I)." Actually it is IV Esdras 1:7–24 (=V Esdras 1:7–24). The Latin IV Esdras was the source of other prominent texts of Gregorian chant, but it may have been only an indirect source for the *Improperia* because the textual resemblances are not as close as with Mic. 6:3.

[27] Michel Tarchnischvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'église de Jérusalem* 2 (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 205; Scriptores Iberici, 14) (Louvain, 1960): 109–14. A. Papadopoulos-Keramevs, "Typikon tēs en Ierosolymois ekklēsias," *Analekta Ierosolymitikēs Stachyologias* 2 (St. Petersburg, 1894): 148–54. Anton Baumstark, "Die Idiomela der byzantinischen Karfreitagshoren in syrischer Überlieferung," *Oriens Christianus* 3rd ser., 3/4 (1930): 232–47.

But this is illusory: Werner's troparia column does not cover the complete series and includes only selected blessings from some of them in order to arrive artificially at the symbolic number 14. Nor does he point out that the ordering of the troparia varies completely between the Greek and Georgian sources. There are many other inaccuracies throughout.[28]

Werner's treatment of the *Improperia* points to another weakness prominent in *TSB* and his other writings, namely his propensity for building up dubious cases by constructing long concatenations of incorrect, misinterpreted, and irrelevant evidence. An example is the section on "The Octoechos in Oral and Written Tradition," part of a chapter on "Transmission and Transmitters between Synagogue and Church."[29] The reason for discussing the Octoechos (the system of the eight "church modes") here is Werner's longstanding opinion that it was transmitted to the Church from the Synagogue. Because there is no real evidence that Jews ever used a system of eight modes, Werner's past writings on this subject often dealt largely with ancient numerological speculations about the number eight, many of them taken from ancient Near Eastern but non-Israelite sources.[30] Having little new evidence to add here in *TSB2*, Werner instead quotes long lists of opinions by earlier authors, dating back to the

---

[28] For example, the text "Non dicant Judaei" (*TSB2*, p. 128), which is from a sermon of St. Augustine (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, vol. 39, p. 810) did not "follow upon the *Improperia*," as Werner says, but was read hours earlier at Matins; it was not "eliminated by Pope John XXIII" (although John did change some other anti-Jewish texts) and survived until the reform of the Breviary following Vatican II. As for the problems of identifying and dating Martène's sources (p. 133), these have largely been solved by Aimé-Georges Martimort, *La Documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène: Étude codicologique* (Studi e Testi, 279) (Vatican City, 1978); see especially pp. 48–49, 93, 237–38.

[29] Published earlier as "Musical Tradition and Its Transmitters Between Synagogue and Church," *Yuval* 2 (1971): 163–80. The conclusion promised for the next volume at the end of the article did not in fact appear there; presumably it developed into pp. 193–212 of *TSB2*.

[30] There is still no general agreement on the origin of the Octoechos, although it is often surmised that it was Semitic and that the number eight was arrived at for numerological reasons. But it is also possible to justify opposing views. See Aelred Cody, "The Early History of the Octoechos in Syria," *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Dumbarton Oaks Symposium, 1980), ed. Nina Garsoïan, Thomas F. Matthews, and Robert W. Thomson (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 89–113.

seventeenth century, on the answer to the question "Did the Primitive Christian Church borrow originally Jewish tunes?" (p. 180). The vast majority of these opinions have no critical value today, for the authors had no historical evidence to go by. They were simply guessing or repeating the accepted beliefs of their times. Besides, hardly any of the passages that Werner cites deal specifically with the Octoechos, the announced subject of this particular section. The catena of authorities begins outside the topic and leads nowhere.

Werner's habit of stringing together unrelated and misunderstood bits of information is best exemplified by his many discussions of the *Tropos Spondeiakos*. In *TSB2* this subject comes up in his chapter on "The Genesis of the *Sanctus* in Jewish and Christian Liturgies."[31] The Qeduššah/Sanctus is one of the few genuine similarities in the liturgies of Church and Synagogue, but it remains possible that the two originated independently, for Christian liturgies earlier than the fourth century do not have it.[32] In this chapter Werner reiterates one of his most persistent and potentially important claims, namely that the Jewish and Christian melodic traditions for the Qeduššah/Sanctus and for many other liturgical texts can be traced back to an ancient melody or scale—the Tropos Spondeiakos. The chain of faulty reasoning begins with a remark of Clement of Alexandria (died ca. 215), who wrote that "among the ancient Greeks, at their drinking parties, a song called the skolion was sung over their brimming cups after the manner of the Hebrew psalms."[33] Clement's intention, of course, was to contrast the licentious carousing of the Greeks with the chaste psalmody of the Christians, for which reason he went on to advocate "grave and temperate melodies" and the avoidance of "chromatic harmonies." Werner somehow

---

[31] It reproduces almost unchanged his article "The Genesis of the Liturgical Sanctus," *Essays Presented to Egon Wellesz*, ed. Jack Westrup (Oxford, 1966), pp. 19–32.

[32] On the Apostolic Constitutions, one of the few Christian texts that seems genuinely close to the Jewish background, we now have David A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Brown Judaic Studies, 65) (Chico, California, 1985).

[33] I am using the translation given in James McKinnon, *Music in Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), p. 34, though I changed the spelling of "skolion."

understands all this to mean that the Greek skolion and the Hebrew psalmody were in the same musical mode, though he nowhere explains this hermeneutical leap in his many references to the passage. From there Werner goes on to assert that this common mode must have been the Tropos Spondeiakos, discussed by a few ancient Greek theorists. The reason for this assertion is apparently that Werner supposes that the Tropos Spondeiakos must have been the mode of the skolion or secular drinking song. But in fact it served, like the Spondaic poetic meter, for the singing of the spondē, the ritual libation or wine-offering with which the drinking party began. One may well ask whether ancient Jews or Christians would have performed psalmody in a mode that was characteristically identified with a pagan sacrifice, any more than Clement would have approved of using the "chromatic harmonies" associated with the skolion. But Werner takes matters even further by telling us what sort of mode the Tropos Spondeiakos actually was, "a hexachord based on E, whereby either the F or C, yet never both at the same time, are omitted" (p. 123). Once again, although Werner has been writing about this subject for decades, he has never explained how he arrived at this conclusion, which ignores the enharmonic character of the scale and has little in common with the reconstructions offered by specialists in ancient Greek music.[34] To demonstrate that there are Christian and Jewish melodies with common melodic material, both descended from the Tropos Spondeiakos, Werner reproduces (pp. 124–25) a series of musical examples that he has published many times before,[35] although none of them

[34] See most recently Andrew Barker, *Greek Musical Writings, I: The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge, Eng., 1984), pp. 255–57. Earlier publications available when Werner was writing are no more supportive of his reconstruction. See for instance R. P. Winnington-Ingram, "The Spondeion Scale," *The Classical Quarterly* 22 (1928): 83–91. Kathleen Schlesinger, *The Greek Aulos* (London, 1939; reprinted Groningen, 1970), pp. 24–25, 39, 414–15. In *TSB* p. 442 Werner quotes from p. 118 of the Schlesinger book, but for some reason attributes it to pp. 205–12. The fact that some modern attempts to reconstruct the spondeion mode begin on the pitch E has to do with modern conventions of transcription and should not be given undue importance.

[35] Many of them seem to have appeared first on an unnumbered page (a facsimile of a handwritten score) following Werner's "Notes on the Attitude of the Early Church Fathers towards Hebrew Psalmody," *The Review of Religion* 7 (1942–43): 339–52. They first appeared set in type on pp. 333–34 of his "The

come from a Christian *Sanctus* or a Hebrew *Qedušša̱h*. The Hebrew examples do present some melodic similarities to the Latin and Greek Christian ones, but when they are checked against the source from which Werner took them,[36] we find that they too have been distorted to strengthen the resemblances. Melodic fragments that are widely separated in Idelsohn's original transcriptions have been run together by Werner, sometimes without any indication, and at times with the wrong textual segment underlaid beneath.[37] While the similarities nevertheless remain, they have in themselves little significance, for melodic resemblances to Gregorian chant have been found in many musical cultures that could not possibly have had contact with medieval Europe or the ancient Near East.[38]

There is, nevertheless, one element of truth in all this. Werner has happened upon the fact, noticed also by other writers, that a number of medieval Christian melodies for the *Sanctus* (and other texts of the Mass ordinary) do indeed utilize a hexachord based on E. This fact probably is historically significant, pointing to an early Christian "modal area," even though we cannot reliably trace it back further to any known ancient Greek or Jewish antecedent. Other writers have published more restrained discussions of the same phenomenon,[39] but Werner feels that he has not received due credit for noticing it first (p. 245, n. 58). This is not

---

Doxology in Synagogue and Church: A Liturgico-Musical Study," *HUCA* 19 (1945–46), and from there were reprinted in many other publications, including pp. 341–42 of *TSB*. In *TSB2* Werner gives as his source (but without a complete citation) the article "The Conflict Between Hellenism and Judaism in the Music of the Early Christian Church," *HUCA* 20 (1947): 407–70, especially pp. 427–28.

[36] A. Z. Idelsohn, *Thesaurus of Hebrew Oriental Melodies*, 10 vols. (Berlin, Leipzig, 1914–32).

[37] Compare number 6 (V'hakohanim) on *TSB2*, p. 124 with its source, Idelsohn 5 (1929): 95. Compare the "Yemenite Sh'ma" on *TSB2*, p. 125 with the texted example in *TSB*, p. 342, and with its original source in Idelsohn 1 (1st ed., 1914), p. 71, or 2nd ed. (1925), music p. 18.

[38] Among the numerous examples that could be cited from all over the world, see the two old Korean melodies in Hye-Ku Lee, *Essays on Traditional Korean Music*, tr. and ed. Robert C. Provine (Seoul, 1981). Compare the melody on p. 66 (dated ca. 1600) with "V'hakohanim," *TSB2*, p. 124. Compare the melodies on p. 210 (dated 1759 and ca. 1500) with the eighth (plagal G) Gregorian psalm tone and similar melodies.

[39] See especially Kenneth Levy, "The Byzantine Sanctus and its Modal Tradition in East and West," *Annales musicologiques* 6 (1958–63): 7–67.

the only instance where some of Werner's speculations pointed to what would become fruitful areas of research for more cautious scholars. In chapter 7 of *TSB2*, "Art Music and Folklore in Ritual,"[40] Werner attempts to develop an ethnomusicological perspective, writing just before more successful essays of this sort began to appear.[41] In the final chapter, Werner seeks to turn attention to some of the geographic areas "where primitive Christians and Jews lived in proximity" (p. 193), anticipating a widespread interest in this topic that would produce many important studies.[42] In these and other cases, however, it is not that other scholars took their ideas from Werner. It is rather that Werner, exploring on his own through the many areas that touch upon his subject, was sometimes among the first to observe interesting phenomena that others would also discover and study more carefully.

This is, indeed, the role that Werner has deliberately set himself, according to his own statement of principle at the end of *TSB2*: "We shall, I hope, always return from minute and specific analysis and individual problems to survey and synthesis. Not even the fear of committing occasional blunders must keep us from striving ever and anew to synthetic, i.e., generalizing judge-

---

[40] A revision of "Two Types of Ritual and their Music," *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, 2 (Jerusalem, 1974): 975–1008.

[41] See the papers from the sessions entitled "Transmission and Form in Oral Traditions," chaired by Leo Treitler, and "Mediterranean Studies: Chant Traditions and Liturgy," chaired by Edith Gerson-Kiwi, in International Musicological Society, *Report of the Twelfth Congress, Berkeley 1977*, ed. Daniel Heartz and Bonnie Wade (Basel, 1981), pp. 139–211, 402–35. See also Johanna Spector, "The Role of Ethnomusicology in the Study of Jewish Music," *Musica Judaica* 4 (1981–82): 20–31.

[42] Jacob Neusner, *Aphrahat and Judaism: The Jewish-Christian Argument in Fourth-Century Iran* (Leiden, 1970). Robert L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology* (New Haven, 1971). W. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (Society of Biblical Literature. Sources for Biblical Study, 13) (Missoula, Montana, 1978). Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York, 1983). Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 4) (Berkeley, California, 1983). Zvi Ankori, *Yahadut we-Yawanut noṣrit, mifgash we-imut bi-meruṣat ha-dorot*, 1 (Tel-Aviv, 1984).

ments. The general self-limitation to highly specific problems without the redeeming synopsis of synthesis would reduce our discipline to the realm of a 'bookkeeper of phenomena'. . ." (p. 211); "Galileo . . . took the necessary risk of simplification and so must we. Without it, musicologists would relapse into a study of watermarks and inks, of medieval clausulae and rightly forgotten systems of notation, of echoing or correcting *obiter dicta* of former and greater generations" (p. 212). While most musicologists would bristle at the disparagement of medieval clausulae and notations, this is as fair an assessment of Werner's writings as one can expect to find, and indeed it takes us to the heart of the matter. Werner has always favored "the redeeming synopsis of synthesis" over "self-limitation to highly specific problems," undaunted by "the fear of committing occasional blunders." At the "risk of simplification," indeed of oversimplification, he has boldly "striven ever and anew to synthetic, i.e., generalizing judgements," which, although they lacked a firm basis in the "minute and specific analysis" of "individual problems," were nonetheless highly provocative, challenging others to offer a more accurate account of this intensely interesting but excruciatingly complex subject. In this Werner has chosen for himself the role of trailblazer: and if the trail has not brought us definitively home, the blazes have at least marked out some of the countless areas where "minute analyses" will be needed before any individual can hope to succeed at the kind of synthesis Werner has attempted.

The book closes with a warning: "It is the intellectual as well as the moral obligation of the [Sacred] bridge's custodians to keep it accessible and serviceable at all times. Yet to be faithful to their duty they must be convinced of the bridge's value and even more that it is worth their effort to know the people *on the other side* [italics original] and the cargo that is being carried over it in an endless stream. Let us remember, finally, that when the bridge is in peril, both sides must help to maintain it and to save it" (p. 212). This helps to clarify what Werner actually believes the Sacred Bridge to be. It is not an archaeological ruin that was crossed once long ago and then fell into disuse, but a permanent structure over which cargo is still being carried, and which continues to need repair. I agree that there is such a bridge between Christianity and Judaism, but surely it is not liturgical music or even liturgy itself. The real Sacred Bridge is the Bible, from which

liturgy and psalmody, law and custom, theology and folklore, and so much else arch out in two very different directions. It is in their interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures that both the agreements and the disagreements between the two religions begin, and it is primarily there, if anywhere, that they have any common ground.

But what is the peril against which Werner warns us? It is explained more fully in his preface. There he says that though he was once "convinced that both Church and Synagogue were bent on guarding and preserving their oldest and most cherished traditions," he now believes that he "could not have been more mistaken. The Catholic Church, yielding to internal pressure, has relinquished a good deal of its liturgico-musical tradition. . . ." And Judaism has fared no better: in the Diaspora it "has made concessions to every movement, right or left, secular or orthodox," while in Israel "the fossilization of Orthodox Judaism may soon be accomplished" (p. xi). Not everyone will agree with these assessments of the present-day Church and Synagogue. But Werner has at least put his finger on one more thing that the two religions have in common. Each has inherited from its past a rich tradition that includes, among many things, a liturgy and its chant. Each is being forced by a rapidly changing world to sift this tradition, to preserve or revive whatever is still of value in it, and to leave behind the accumulated cultural baggage that, much as we may still love some of it, will not make it through the current bottleneck into the twenty-first century. The challenge is to remain faithful to what has been handed down, while still remaining open to all that the human race has learned in the social, political, and scientific revolutions of the last few centuries. This very sifting process provides both communities with an unparalleled opportunity to reconsider traditional mistrusts and misunderstandings, to inquire whether these are not among the baggage that should now be left behind, and to begin to forge a new relationship of mutual respect. The conviction that Jews and Christians guard a common treasury has been perhaps the most persistent theme in Werner's writings, and I believe it is the one legacy he would most prefer to leave us.